

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 04184 01 OF 02 071038Z

11

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 NSAE-00 NSCE-00 SSO-00 USIE-00

INRE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01

PRS-01 SS-15 NEA-10 TRSE-00 MBFR-04 SAJ-01 IO-13

ACDA-19 OMB-01 DRC-01 AEC-11 OIC-04 /143 W

----- 031285

O R 070930Z SEP 73

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1459

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 4184

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: COMMENTS ON I.S. DRAFT OF INTRODUCTION AND SECTION II  
(THIRD REVISION)

REF: USNATO 4154

SUMMARY: SENIOR POLADS ON SEPT 4 HAD FURTHER PARAGRAPH-BY-PARAGRAPH REVIEW OF "INFRODUCTION" AND "ALLIED POSITION" SECTIONS OF INTERNATIONAL STAFF DRAFT (USNATO 4075). IS SUBSEQUENTLY PREPARED A THIRD REVISED DRAFT (REFTEL). THIS MESSAGE CONTAINS MISSION COMMENTS ON REVISED DRAFT AND RELATED SPC DISCUSSION.

PRINCIPAL DEVELOPMENT AT SEPT 4 MEETING WAS UK WILLINGNESS TO DROP UK ALTERNATIVE PARAGRAPHS ON SEVERAL POINTS IN FAVOR OF NEW U.S. FORMULATIONS. DISCUSSION INDICATED, HOWEVER, STRENGTHENING INTEREST AMONG ALLIES IN EXTENDING AREA OF APPLICATION OF STABILIZING MEASURES AND DISPOSITION OF SOVIET FORCES BEYOND NATO GUIDELINES AREA. ALLIES ARE ALSO INCREASINGLY OPPOSED TO USE OF "700,000" FIGURE. TURKEY BRACKETED U.S. FIRST-STAGE REDUCTION PROPOSAL.

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 04184 01 OF 02 071038Z

AT U.S. REP'S SUGGESTION, SPC WILL MEET AGAIN ON NEW DRAFT ON SEPT 10, TO GIVE IS TIME TO PREPARE FOURTH REVISED DRAFT FOR REVIEW BY THE COUNCIL ON SEPT 12. SEPTELS FOLLOW ON SEPT 5 SPC DISCUSSION

OF SECTION III (NEGOTIATING STRATEGY) AND WORK PROGRAM OF AD HOC GROUP. ACTION REQUESTED: GUIDANCE ON THIRD DRAFT (REFTEL) IN TIME FOR SEPT 10 SPC MEETING. END SUMMARY

1. SEPT 4 DISCUSSION OPENED WITH STATEMENT BY UK REP (THOMSON) THAT, AS HIS DELEGATION HAD INTIMATED EARLIER (USNATO 4074), IN LIGHT OF NEW U.S. AMENDMENTS TO SECTION II AND II HE WOULD BE ABLE TO MOVE TOWARDS CONSENSUS ON SEVERAL POINTS. HE WOULD DO THIS ONLY IN CLEAR UNDERSTANDING THAT SECTIONS II AND III ARE INSEPARABLY LINKED. HE THEN SUGGESTED THAT COMMITTEE DEFER DISCUSSION OF SECTION III UNTIL

SEPT 5 AND HAVE FRESH PARAGRAPH-BY-PARAGRAPH OF SECTION II.

2. DUTCH REP (SIZOO) REPORTED THAT NETHERLANDS AUTHORITIES HAD RECENTLY DECIDED AT HIGH LEVEL TO ENDORSE BASIC U.S. APPROACH TO MBFR (USNATO 4159). NORWEGIAN REP (KRISTVIK) REITERATED SUPPORT FOR U.S. APPROACH, BUT ADDED THAT OSLO WOULD INSIST ON UNDIMINISHED SECURITY FOR THE FLANKS AND CIRCULATED PROPOSAL (PARA 12 BIS BELOW) TO APPLY CONSTRAINTS OUTSIDE OF NGA.

3. REMAINDER OF THIS MESSAGE IS KEYED TO PARAGRAPHS IN NEW IS DRAFT OF SECTION II (REFTEL):

PARA 3: UK DROPPED ITS ALTERNATIVE FORMULATION IN FAVOR OF U.S.M PARAGRAPH, IN LIGHT OF "EXTREMELY HELPFUL" U.S. CONTRIBUTION ON SECTION III. BELGIUM REP (28))95) OBJECTED TO SECOND SENTENCESINCE THERE IS POSSIBILITY THAT SOVIETS MIGHT LEARN OF IT. U.S. REP SAID HE WOULD RECOMMEND DELETION OF SENTENCE IN LIGHT AGREEMENT TO SUBSTANCE NOTED IN FOOTNOTE. (COMMENT: WE BELIEVE THAT WILLOT HAS A GOOD POINT AND THAT THE SUBSTANCE OF THE SENTENCE IS MORE ADEQUATELY COVERED IN SECTION III. RECOMMEND DELETION. END COMMENT)

PARA 4 BIS: THOMSON PROPOSED THESE DEFINITIONS TO AVOID CONFUSION IN SUBSEQUENT ALLIED DISCUSSIONS AND DRAFTS. (COMMENT: WE AGREE WITH UK THAT THESE ARE USEFUL CLARIFICATIONS. END COMMENT)

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 04184 01 OF 02 071038Z

PARA 5: UK DROPPED ITS EARLIER PARAGRAPH ON "UNDIMINISHED SECURITY" --BUT TO LATE TO PREVENT FLANKS STATES FROM LATCHING ON TO IT. TURKISH REP (TULUMEN) ARGUED VEHEMENTLY THAT A REFERENCE TO THE UNDIMINISHED SECURITY OF THE FLANKS HAD TO APPEAR IN SECTION II, AND KRISTVIK PROPOSED FINAL SENTENCE OF PRESENT PARAGRAPH. KRISTVIK WARNED THAT OSLO WOULD "NEVER UNDERSTAND" ALLIED REFUSAL TO INCLUDE THIS LANGUAGE. U.S., UK, BELGIUM, FRG AND EVEN DEMARK AGRUED THAT, WHILE THEY HAD NO SUBSTANTIVE OBJECTION TO GENERAL IDEA, THIS PROVISION WOULD BETTER APPEAR IN THE SECRET GUIDELINES (SECTION I) WHERE IN FACT THERE ALREADY EXISTS A SECTION ON "GEOGRAPHIC AND RELATED CONCERNS." (COMMENT: STRONG TURKISH AND NORWEGIAN ADVOCACY OF THIS PARAGRAPH REFLECTS THEIR GROWING CONCERN OVER EFFECT ON MBFR ON FLANKS. TURKISH DELOFF TOLD US PRIVATELY AT ANKARA IS "DEEPLY

DISMAYED" BY WHAT IT VIEWS AS TOTAL ABSENCE IN U.S. PROPOSALS OF ANY SAFEGUARD FOR TURKISH SECURITY INTERESTS. WE BELIEVE IT MAY BE POSSIBLE TO DEVELOP A MORE GENERALIZED FORMULATION FOR FINAL SENTENCE E.G. "ALLIED PROPOSALS SHOULD PRESERVE THE SECURITY OF EACH ALLY, TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE CONCERNS OF THE NATO FLANK COUNTRIES." END COMMENT)

PARA 6: UK DROPPED FORMER SECOND SENTENCE ON APPLICATION TO FORCES RATHER THAN TERRITORIES. FRG (HOYNCK) PROPOSED NEW SECOND SENTENCE. ITALY ASKED THAT IDEA IN FORMER UK SENTENCE BE RETAINED (THUS NEW BRACKETED THIRD SENTENCE).

PARA 6, SUBPARA (III): FRG REP PREFERRED TO DROP THIS MEASURE. BELGIAN REP AGAIN ASKED U.S. REP FOR EXPLANATION OF "LOCATIONS," PARTICULARLY IN VIEW OF LIMITED LOCATIONS AVAILABLE TO ALLIED FORCES FOR EXERCISES. (COMMENT: REQUEST GUIDANCE. END COMMENT)

PARA 7: THOMSON DROPPED UK ALTERNATIVE PARAGRAPH 7 AND 7 BIS AND ACCEPTED U.S. VERSION, BUT SAID THAT HIS MOVE HAD TO BE SEEN IN LIGHT OF A PROPOSED UK REVISION OF PARA 13 OF U.S. PAPER ON SECTION

III. (TEXT OF UK REVISION IN SECTION III FOLLOWS: "... THE PARAMETERS OF THEIR POSITION, BY PUTTING FORWARD THE CONCEPT OF AN EVENTUAL COMMON CEILING BUT WITHOUT SPECIFYING EXACTLY WHAT THE LEVEL OF THIS COMMON CEILING WOULD BE. (IN ADVANCING THE IDEA OF AN EVENTUAL COMMON CEILING, WESTERN NEGOTIATORS SHOULD INDICATE THAT IT COULD NOT BE CALCULATED ON BASIS OF MANPOWER ALONE BUT THAT OTHER ELEMENTS SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 04184 01 OF 02 071038Z

E.G. TANKS, NEED TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.) IN ADDITION TO THE NOTION OF AN EVENTUAL COMMON CEILING, WESTERN NEGOTIATORS WOULD INCLUDE IN THEIR INITIAL FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL THE PARAMETERS OF THE FIRST PHASE, I.E. THE SOVIET TANK ARMY AND THE 15 PERCENT U.S. REDUCTIONS. BUT A FINAL DECISION ON WHICH FIGURES SHOULD BE TABLED AT PARTICULAR POINTS IN THE NEGOTIATIONS NEED NOT BE

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 04184 02 OF 02 071116Z

11  
ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 NSAE-00 NSCE-00 SSO-00 USIE-00

INRE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01

PRS-01 SS-15 NEA-10 TRSE-00 MBFR-04 SAJ-01 IO-13

ACDA-19 OMB-01 AEC-11 OIC-04 DRC-01 /143 W

----- 031594

O R 070930Z SEP 73  
FM USMISSION NATO  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1460  
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE  
INFO USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 4184

TAKEN NOW.") WILLOT ASKED FOR SECOND SENTENCE PRINCIPALLY TO REFER TO FACT ALLIES HAVE NOT YET AGREED ON DATA. PENULTIMATE SENTENCE (U.S. BRACKETS) IS FRG PROPOSAL. UK ACCEPTED IT, ON THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THE ALLIES WOULD HAVE TO EXAMINE FURTHER WHAT WAS MEANT BY "TANKS". (COMMENT: UK AND OTHERS ATTACH IMPROTANCE TO THIS TEXT AND OUR ACCEPTANCE WOULD HELP WITH THE COMBAT CAPABILITY ISSUE. END COMMENT.) RE FINAL SENTENCE, U.S. REP AGRUED AGAINST USE OF TERM "FLOOR". WILLOT AGREED THAT, FOR HIS PART, HE WOULD NOT INSIST ON TERM "FLOOR," ALTHOUGH HE WOULD CONTINUE TO INSIST ON THE IDEA.

PARA 8: THOMSON AGREED TO USE OF 700,000 FIGURE AS LONG AS IT WAS "EXPRESSED FOR CONFIDENTIAL GUIDANCE WITHIN THE ALLIANCE AT THIS STAGE." LONDON'S PRINCIPAL OBJECTION TO FIGURE WAS THAT IT IS TOO SIMPLISTIC AND DOES NOT TAKE ADEQUATE ACCOUNT OF OTHER FACTORS, SUCH AS COMBAT CAPABILITY. ITALIAN REP (SPINELLI) OPPOSED USE OF FIGURE AS DID SIZOO, WHO STATED THAT THE HAGUE WAS EVEN AGAINST USING THE TERM "COMMON CEILING" WITH THE SOVIETS. BOTH REPS WERE CONCERNED THAT USE OF FIGURE WOULD PREJUDGE RESULTS OF SECOND PHASE AND COULD HAVE ADVERSE IMPACT ON EUROPEAN DEFENSE EFFORTS. (COMMENT: IN VIEW OF GROWING OPPOSITION  
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 04184 02 OF 02 071116Z

TO PROMINENT USE OF 700,000 FIGURES, REQUEST GUIDANCE ON WHETHER WE COULD PROPOSE THE FOLLOWING FORMULATION, PICKING UP ON UK SUGGESTION: "(THIS FIGURE IS EXPRESSED FOR CONFIDENTIAL GUIDANCE WHITHIN THE ALLIANCE AT THIS STAGE. THE QUESTION OF HOW SPECIFIC THE ALLIES WILL BE IN ISSUSTRATING THEIR FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL IS DISCUSSED IN SECTION III)." WE WOULD, OF COURSE, MAKE OUR FINAL ACCEPTANCE THIS FORMULATION CONTINGENT UPON SATISFACTORY RESOLUTION OF PARA 13 IN SECTION III. END COMMENT)

PARA 10: UK DROPPED ITS ALTERNATIVE PARA, BUT ADDED FOOTNOTE. TURKEY BRACKETED PARAGRAPH, HOWEVER, WITH FIRM STATEMENT BY TULUMEN THAT HE MAY HAVE TO RETAIN BRACKETS "FOR A LONG TIME," I.E., UNTIL OTHER ALLIES CONVINCE TURKEY THAT THIS FIRST PHASE REDUCTION PROPOSAL WOULD NOT DAMAGE THE SECURITY INTERESTS  
OF THE FLANKS.

PARA 11 (I): UK INTRODUCED TERM "WITHDRAWAL/REDUCTION," PRESUMABLY TO MAKE DISTINCTION BETWEEN SOVIET "WITHDRAWALS" AND EVENTUAL EUROPEA

N

ALLIED "REDUCTIONS." I.E., BETWEEN FIRST AND SECOND PHASE. FORMER  
SUBPARA (III) NOW APPEARS AT  
SUBPARA (II) IN PARA 12 BIS, WITH TURKISH ADDITION OF "NORTHERN"  
MILITARY DISTRICT.

PARA 11 (III): THOMSON INDICATED THAT UK MIGHT EVENTUALLY DROP  
THIS PROPOSAL. AGAIN, HOWEVER, UK WITHDRAWAL CAME TO LATE, AND  
TULUMEN STRONGLY ENDORSED THIS MEASURE AS "ABSOLUTE MINIMUM" WHICH  
ALLIES SHOULD REQUIRE FROM SOVIETS.

HEADING BETWEEN PARAS 11 AND 12: HOYNCK PROPOSED REVERSING THE  
HEADING SUGGESTED BY U.S., SINCE FRG CONSIDERS THAT NON-CIR-  
CUMVENTION PROVISIONS ARE A FORM OF STABILIZING MEASURE AND NOT  
VICE VERSA.

PARA 12 (II): BELGIUM JOINED FRG IN OPPOSING THIS MEASURE.  
BELGIUM IS CONCERNED OVER EFFECT OF THIS MEASURE ON EUROPEAN FORCES  
IN PHASE 2 NEGOTIATIONS, AND FRG HAS ADDITIONAL OBJECTIONS THAT THIS  
MEASURE WOULD FURTHER TEND TO DEFINE A SPECIAL ZONE, AND WOULD  
INCREASE POSSIBILITY THAT "NATIONAL BOUNDARIES" PER SE MIGHT BE  
DISCUSSED IN MBFR CONTEXT. (COMMENT: THESE ARE STRONG OBJECTIONS  
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 04184 02 OF 02 071116Z

WHICH

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 02 APR 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 07 SEP 1973  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** boyleja  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1973NATO04184  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1973/newtext/t19730962/abqcebxi.tel  
**Line Count:** 243  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 5  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** USNATO 4154  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** boyleja  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:** ANOMALY  
**Review Date:** 14 AUG 2001  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <14-Aug-2001 by garlanwa>; APPROVED <24-Sep-2001 by boyleja>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: COMMENTS ON I.S. DRAFT OF INTRODUCTION AND SECTION II (THIRD REVISION)  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005